UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,685	08/26/2003	Joshy Joseph	POU920030043US1	3776

46429   7590   08/06/2008
CANTOR COLBURN LLP-IBM POUGHKEEPSIE
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103

EXAMINER
SEYE, ABDOU K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

Office Action Summary

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 May 2008</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 11-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 11-20</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 September 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-5 and 11-20 are pending in this application

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.　The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter
> sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have
> been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art
> to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in
> which the invention was made.

3.　Claims 1-5 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable

over Sankar (US 7065706) in view of Karamchedu et al. (6345351).

4. As per Claims 1 and 11, Sankar teaches the invention substantially as claimed

including a method for dynamically associating type information about extensible

messages in a service-oriented architecture, the method comprising:

configuring a simple object access protocol (SOAP) message header associated

with a SOAP message body to include message meta-data (Figure 2: 32a and 14b; col.

5, lines 20-67 and col. 6, lines 1-33) ; and a semantic type information (Figure 2:31b;

active semantics).

5. However, Sankar does not explicitly teach that the semantic type information is

included in the message header describing at least a portion of the content of the SOAP

message body so as to enable a receiver to interpret and process the content of the

SOAP message body using the meta-data and included in the SOAP message header,

thereby facilitating a dynamic exchange of semantic type information and meta-data

information for open content message exchange between a sender and the receiver.

6. Whereas, in the same field of endeavor Karamchedu discloses a method for

semantic qualification and contextualization of electronic messages where semantic

type qualifiers/information are included in the header within an electronic message (

paragraph 22).

7. It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify Sankar's invention with Karamchedu's invention to include

semantic type information in a header within a SOAP electronic message. One would

be motivated to include semantic type information in the header section within an

electronic message in order to facilitate semantic based searching, and post-processing

of electronic messages (Karamchedu s; abstract).

8. As to claim 2, Sankar teaches, wherein said SOAP message header includes an

extensible markup language (XML) schema for an XML type message (Figure 2: 14).

9. As to claim 3, Sankar teaches, wherein said SOAP message header further includes

at least one object system type (Figure 2; col. 5, lines 39-40; where the claimed

element "POservice" of Sankar reference meets the claimed limitation of the claim).

10. As to claim 4, Sankar teaches, wherein said SOAP message header further includes

a resource description framework (RDF) description of the message (Figure 2:30; col.

6, lines 3-6).

11. As to claim 5, Sankar teaches, wherein said SOAP message header further includes

a reference to <any> data included within the body of the SOAP message (col. 6, lines

30-33).

12. As to claim 12, Sankar teaches, processing said meta-data with at least one meta-data processor, said meta- data processing being implemented with at least one of a SOAP processor and an XML processor; wherein said at least one meta-data processor and said at least one of a SOAP processor and an XML processor are configured to validate and map the extensible XML messages (FIG. 2: 14 and 32a).

13. As to claim 13, it rejected for the same reasons as claim 4 above.

14. As to claim14, Sankar teaches, wherein said generating message meta-data further comprises associating, through a sender, the meta-data at runtime using application programming (API) interfaces (Figure 2: 28).

15. As to claim 15, Sankar teaches, wherein said generating message meta-data further comprises associating, through a send side receiver, the meta-data at runtime based upon a defined message extension policy for an XML message (col. 6, lines 1-33).

16. As to claims 16-18, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 15 above.

17. As to claim 19, Sankar teaches, wherein said one or more meta-data

processors created by said server side SOAP handler is configured to load an

associated XML schema from a uniform resource identifier (URI) location specified in

the SOAP header (col. 6, lines 10-20).

18. As to claim 20, Sankar teaches, wherein said associating XML processor

generates warning messages upon encountering at least one of XML elements and

XML attributes that are unspecified by the XML schema (col. 6, lines 50-56).

Conclusion

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Exr. Abdou Seye whose telephone number is (571) 270-1062. The

examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. If

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, contact the examiner's supervisor,

An Meng at (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for formal or official faxes to Technology

Center 3600 is (571) 273-8300. Draft or informal faxes, which will not be entered in the

application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 273-6722. Any inquiry of a

general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the

Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

/Meng-Ai An/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195